

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY****RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JAN 06 2007****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

First Named Applicant: Dwork	)	Art Unit: 2135
	)	
Serial No.: 09/487,502	)	Examiner: Klimach
	)	
Filed: January 19, 2000	)	AM9-99-0138
	)	
For: <b>DIGITAL SIGNATURE SYSTEM AND METHOD</b>	)	January 6, 2007
<b>BASED ON HARD LATTICE PROBLEM</b>	)	750 B STREET, Suite 3120
	)	San Diego, CA 92101
	)	

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA

Dear Sir:

The Office Action dated January 4, 2007 is almost indecipherable and must be reissued with at least some modicum of clarity.

1. The Office Action Summary Sheet indicates that claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9-26, 28, 29, and 33-35 are rejected. The formal statement of rejection on the very next page, however, indicates that only claims 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being non-statutory.
2. However, under "allowable subject matter", claims 1-11 and 19-35 are indicated as being allowed.
3. However, claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 27, and 30-32 can neither rejected nor allowed. They are canceled.
4. To compound confusion, right after the formal statement of rejection indicating the claims 12-18 are rejected under Section 101, the very first sentence discusses claims 1-11 and 26-35, and the next sentence, which logically would seem to refer to the first, launches into an allegation of a collection of information not

1033-73.AM2